

#5 Response
JYJ
3/4/03

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Arthur K. Farnsworth et al.

Serial No.: 09/717,544

Filed: November 21, 2000

For: ACCESS PANEL LATCHING SYSTEM

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Group Art Unit: 3676

Examiner: Walsh, John B.

Atty. Docket: COMP:0132/VAN
P00-3180

Official

Assistant Commissioner
for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION OR MAILING 37 C.F.R. 1.8	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by facsimile to the United States Patent and Trademark Office in accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.6(d) or is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on the date below:	
March 3, 2003 Date	<i>Carla Deblaw</i> Carla Deblaw

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION
MAILED ON JANUARY 2, 2003

FAX RECEIVED

MAR 04 2003

Dear Sir:

REMARKS

GROUP 3600

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4-15, 17-19, and 25-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raffman, U.S. Patent No. 2,878,389. Claims 1, 2, 4-15, 17-19, and 25-27 are patentable because the Raffman reference does not teach, suggest, or disclose all of the recited features of the claims. Reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested.

The burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness falls on the Examiner. *Ex parte Wolters and Kuypers*, 214 U.S.P.Q. 735 (PTO Bd. App. 1979). To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. M.P.E.P. § 2143.03 (citing *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (CCPA 1974)). "All words in a claim must be considered in